UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2568th MEETING: 28 FEBRUARY 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2568)	1
Expression of welcome to the new Permanent Representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2568th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 28 February 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Natarajan KRISHNAN (India).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2568)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

Expression of welcome to the new Permanent Representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

1. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the members of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to our new colleague, Mr. Guennadi Iossifovich Oudovenko, representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. We look forward to co-operating with him in the work of the Council.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

2. The PRESIDENT: Since this is the first formal meeting of the Council for the month of February, I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Claude de Kémoularia, representative of France, for the great diplomatic skill, dynamism, patience and courtesy with which he conducted the business of the Council last month. I am sure I speak for all members in expressing deep appreciation to Mr. de Kémoularia for the very efficient manner in which he conducted the business of the Council as its President for the month of January.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Israel, Lebanon and Qatar in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Netanyahu (Israel) and Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

4. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 28 February 1985 from the representative of Qatar [*S/16989*], which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour, in my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations, to request that the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States, to attend the meetings of the Council on the item entitled 'The situation in the Middle East'."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Maksoud.

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in the letter dated 25 February from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the President of the Council [*S/16983*]. Members of the Council also have before them document S/16974 and S/16974/Add.1, which contain the texts of letters dated 21 and 25 February, from the representative of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General.

6. The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, upon whom I now call.

7. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council for this month. May I express our full confidence in your expe-

rience, capability and wisdom in the leadership of the Council. I also wish to express our appreciation of the efforts you have been exerting to resolve the issues before the Council.

8. I take this opportunity to thank Mr. Claude de Kémoularia, the representative of France, a friendly country closely linked to mine, Lebanon, for the expertise, capability and courtesy he showed in his leadership of the Council in the month of January.

9. In a statement I made before the Council on 21 May 1984, I said:

> "Had we decided to lodge a complaint with the Council about every aggressive act or practice on the part of Israel we could have taken up all the Council's time from now until the end of the year." [*2540th meeting, para. 38.*]

10. Six months have passed since the last urgent meeting of the Council that we requested to consider Israeli practices [*S/16713*]. At that series of meetings [*2552nd to 2556th meetings*], the Council was unable to adopt a resolution on a humanitarian issue, despite our warning that its inability to do so might open the way to Israel to persist in its inhuman practices and that Israel might consider itself relieved of all its international commitments, whether to the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or other international conventions, particularly the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] which protects civilians in occupied territories.

11. Since 6 September 1984, we have been presenting to the Secretary-General written complaints, which have been distributed as official documents of the General Assembly and the Security Council. In our last letter, dated 21 February 1985 [*S/16974*], we provided an annex containing a list of Israeli practices and operations in southern Lebanon from 12 to 20 February. Further, on 25 February we sent another letter [*S/16974/Add.1*], including two new lists in annex, and on 26 February we sent yet another letter [*S/16990*] with another list annexed thereto. We have reserved our right to request the Security Council to hold a special meeting if the need arises.

12. We had hoped that having these complaints distributed as official documents would persuade Israel to cease its acts and practices against the population of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. We had also hoped that the information provided daily by the mass media, including press agencies and television and radio stations, would have a positive impact on Israeli officials and lead them to cease the use of their huge military machine—with its tanks, personnel carriers, bulldozers and firepower—to lay siege to peaceful Lebanese villages, storming them and attacking their citizens, defenceless, unarmed old people, women and children, who have only the power of patience against unbearable practices. They are resisting the occupying aggressor with the steadfastness, pride and sincerity of nationalism. As for armed resistance, that is an inevitable result of the Israeli invasion and occupation of Lebanon and the inhuman practices against the inhabitants of Lebanon.

13. In view of the deterioration of the situation in the territories occupied by Israel, the continuing escalation of the siege of villages and towns, the acts of oppression, killing, detention, deportation, demolition of homes, the humiliation of the inhabitants, the indiscriminate firing into homes and streets, arrests and kidnappings, we must once again call upon the Council to hold an urgent meeting at which we can tell it of the latest developments and give a living picture of the suffering of our people in the occupied territories. We hope that as a result there will this time be sympathy with the suffering of the inhabitants of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, leading the Council to adopt a clear, sincere and unanimous resolution calling on Israel to put an immediate end to its military operations and inhuman practices and to implement the Council resolutions on its full withdrawal from Lebanese territories.

14. If Israel had complied with those resolutions and had completed its withdrawal, the situation would not have deteriorated to the extent that it has. Lebanon sincerely attempted to help bring about a successful outcome to the military talks of Naqoura, called for by the Secretary-General with the aim of obtaining full Israeli withdrawal and making arrangements to achieve security and stability after the withdrawal. It was evident that Lebanon would demand from Israel a detailed and specific timetable for its withdrawal. However, Israel refused to present such a timetable, and it continues to do so despite the repeated declarations of its officials.

15. Furthermore, Israel refuses to give any role to the legitimate Lebanese army, and it continues to insist on putting power in the area from the southern Litani River to the international borders in the hands of illegitimate local forces created, armed and trained by Israel. Israel refused to allow the United Nations forces to deploy to the international borders, in accordance with Security Council resolution 425 (1978). It persists in its attempt to empty the southern parts of Lebanon of those forces and insists on their deployment in areas north of the Litani. Israel broke off its participation in the Naqoura talks and presented Lebanon and the United Nations with *faits accomplis*. It then unilaterally began to implement a redeployment of its forces. This intransigence of Israel has led to the suspension of the Naqoura talks, which are now at an impasse, despite the fact that during the talks, in response to an Israeli request, Lebanon presented a complete plan for the deployment of the Lebanese army in the areas to be evacuated by Israel.

16. Lebanon is still prepared to consider anything that will lead to arrangements that would help a planned Israeli withdrawal to take place, as soon as Israel provides what Lebanon has been requesting—a clear and sincere response.

17. The unilateral nature of Israel's redeployment plan in three stages has made it impossible to co-ordinate with Israel. The Sidon and neighbouring regions have been

evacuated by Israel, which predicted that the Lebanese army would be unable to maintain peace and security. It predicted upheavals and bloody confrontations. However, the Lebanese army has entered the region and it is now apparent that Israeli predictions and, perhaps, hopes have not come about. The Lebanese have proved their attachment to Lebanese legitimacy.

18. Lebanon appreciates the very positive role undertaken by the United Nations and by the States participating in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). Lebanon continues to hold to its position, to support UNIFIL's role as long as Israel provides a concrete timetable for its complete withdrawal from Lebanon. We continue to have doubts concerning the last two stages in Israel's redeployment plan, because they still require new decisions by the Israeli Government. Further, it must be said that the third stage of redeployment, according to the decision of the Israeli Government, does not constitute a true withdrawal inasmuch as that decision calls for a security belt in which Israel may maintain nominal forces, a decision whereby Israel arrogates to itself the right to re-enter any region from which it has withdrawn. Israeli military operations and inhumane practices in the regions still under Israeli occupation are daily becoming more severe and more violent, and now call for speedy and urgent action by the Council, to which we have come today with a legitimate complaint based on undeniable and irrefutable facts and evidence. To seek to justify or excuse those actions will not do any good whatever.

19. I shall not reiterate the details of what has happened and continues to happen, since all those events are described in official documents. However, I shall select from among the acts and practices some examples to illustrate Israel's policy of the iron fist and the new forms of individual and mass torture.

20. First, there is the laying siege to towns and villages for a period of from three to six days, as was the case for Kabryha, Taura, Jib Jannin, Arab Salim, Kamed El-Loz, Tair Dibbah, Deir Mimas, Kafr Kila, Qar'un, Deir Kanoun El-Nahr and other towns and villages. Inhabitants are prevented from entering or leaving the towns or villages and supplies from being brought into them. This has led to severe shortages in some of those villages.

21. Second, in addition to the siege by the Israeli forces, they are storming towns and villages, searching houses, storming houses of worship such as mosques and churches and confiscating loudspeakers and other objects, as was the case in the villages of Qar'un and Bazurieh.

22. Third, the demolition of schools and the detention of some teachers, as was the case in the townships of Burj Rahal and Kafr Dounin. Those teachers were removed to places unknown.

23. Fourth, the rounding up of inhabitants, following the storming of their villages, in public squares at night in the rain, which led to the death from exposure of the mayor of Arab Salim.

24. Fifth, the detention in their local bakery of some inhabitants of the village of Kossaibeh in the Nabatieh district. Smoke bombs were thrown into th bakery, the steel door closed and bullets fired at the door to prevent the villagers from escaping. Were it not for a small openin in the bakery's wall which allowed those detained within to breathe, they would have died of suffocation. They were saved by the other inhabitants and then taken to the nearest doctor for treatment.

25. Sixth, in addition to rounding up the inhabitants in schools and squares and, as I have just said, in bakeries, the Israeli forces humiliated people by forcing them to kneel, as was the case in Sir El-Gharbieh where 35 people were detained and then removed to parts unknown. Later on, seven corpses of some of those detained were found, riddled with bullets.

26. Seventh, the variety of torture has not been limited to what I have previously mentioned. In the township of Arab Salim, before 400 detainees, the Israeli forces struck a citizen on the head with a thick stick until blood streamed from his ears. He collapsed. That person's fate is unknown. His name is Hussein Naim Haidar. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was not allowed to investigate the incident.

27. Eighth, the Israeli forces prevented maintenance crews from entering the water purification plant in Shukrah, in the Bent-Jbeil district, thereby endangering the lives of the inhabitants—old people, women and children. UNIFIL forces in Lebanon were not successful in their attempt to intervene in this humanitarian issue.

28. Ninth, flour from the Siblin plant was prevented from reaching the areas of Tyre and Nabatieh despite interventions of the ICRC, which were entirely fruitless.

29. Tenth, in addition to the Israeli forces using armoured vehicles and personnel carriers, they used bulldozers to demolish homes, automobiles and schools or their walls. As for the demolition and indiscriminate firing upon homes, streets and official as well as private schools—in particular in the case of the towns of Haroof and Jbchit—the occupying forces have become used to doing this following their encircling and entering villages and towns, as is shown in the lists annexed to document S/16974 and Add.1.

30. Eleventh, in its insistence on disturbing and harming the inhabitants, the Israeli forces have been destroying large areas of arable land and orchards, as was the case at Taura and in other villages and towns.

31. Twelfth, the Israeli forces used police dogs in their raids and search activities in order to terrorize the inhabitants. That was the case in the town of Deir Kanoun, for example.

32. Thirteenth, on 26 February, the day before yesterday, the occupying forces stormed the Jabal Ahmel Hospital. They fired inside the hospital and tried to enter the operating room in which one of the wounded was undergoing an operation. The doctors blocked their way; so, instead, the occupying forces raided the doctor's room and fired into it [*see S/16990, annex*].

33. Those are some of the living examples which, as I have said, are supported by firm evidence, dates, places, number of forces involved, types of weapons, acts and practices of those forces, including the number of wounded, dead and detainees. They are also examples of the destruction of homes and schools and of the desecration of places of worship, as well as other acts detailed in the three annexes to official documents of the Council [*S/16974, S/16974/Add.1 and S/16990*].

34. The situation in southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and the Rashaya district is deteriorating constantly because of those acts and practices. The imposition of a curfew by the Israeli occupation forces in the area south of the Litani from sunset to sunrise is merely another indication of the serious deterioration.

35. That is why the Council must act quickly and decisively. It must adopt a resolution that includes the following: first, an expression of the deepest concern *vis-à-vis* the Israeli military operations and inhuman practices in the areas of occupied Lebanon; secondly, a demand that Israel cease immediately those acts and operations; thirdly, a condemnation of Israel and a denunciation of its activities and practices which are counter to the universal Declaration on Human Rights and international conventions, more particularly the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949; fourthly, a reaffirmation of the importance of the implementation of the Council's resolutions, beginning with resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) and subsequent decisions, particularly resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982)—and that to ensure complete Israeli withdrawal from the territory of Lebanon and to enable UNIFIL to carry out the task entrusted to it, especially when we consider that most of those acts and practices take place in the areas under UNIFIL mandate; fifthly, a reaffirmation of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and their applicability to the territories occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and the Rashaya district; sixthly, a reaffirmation that the occupying authority must be committed to respect the aforementioned conventions and other rules of international law; seventhly, an affirmation of respect for Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

36. Despite the size and scope of the tragedy, despite the great suffering and despite the great loss of lives and property, we wanted our complaint to be a detailed, objective list of events and incidents with strong and irrefutable proof, so that it would be proportionate to the terrible agony of our people and citizens in southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and the Rashaya district.

37. The Council has a humanitarian duty, in addition to its legal duty stemming from its statute. The Council is called upon today—not tomorrow—to preserve life and property and to maintain peace and security. The Council is called upon to adopt unanimously a resolution protecting the rights and legitimate demands we have outlined—a resolution calling on Israel, in the first place, to put an immediate end to its inhuman military operations and practices.

38. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Qatar, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States at the United Nations for the month of February. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

39. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Speaking today before the Council on behalf of the Group of Arab States, I am pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency for this month.

40. I should like also to thank Mr. de Kémoularia for his firm leadership of the Council last month.

41. I must here point to the close friendship between the Arab nation and your two countries, India and France, and to our relations based on mutual respect and common effort in support of the objectives of the Charter of the United Nations.

42. I should also like to congratulate the new members of the Council which were elected during the last session of the General Assembly, namely, Australia, Denmark, Madagascar, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago. I wish them every success.

43. Once again the Council is considering a Lebanese complaint against the occupying Israeli forces and their practices. Had the previous Council resolutions on this subject been implemented, we would not today be in this painful situation. I refer in particular to resolution 509 (1982), which demanded, clearly and unequivocally, "that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon."

44. However, Israel, with its usual determination to disregard the international Organization, did not heed that resolution; it has flouted that resolution, and other resolutions on the subject. The Council's first duty now is to reaffirm those resolutions and to make Israel commit itself to their implementation.

45. The Lebanese people's legitimate resistance to this tyrannical Israeli occupation—invoked by Israel in a vain attempt to justify its barbaric acts—is the right of every people whose lands have been occupied by force, particularly when the international community is unable to put an end to the occupation or to restore the land to its rightful owners. We believe that it is the legitimate right of the Lebanese people to engage in this resistance and to put an end to the occupation.

46. The Israeli attempt to describe this national resistance as acts of terrorism certainly fools no one. Would we, for instance, have considered members of the French Resistance who resisted the German occupation during the Second World War to be terrorists? Did anyone accuse them of being terrorists? Why should the occupation of Lebanon be different? Can any fair-minded person des-

cribe the activities of this legitimate resistance as acts of terrorism?

47. We note with pride the success of the Lebanese resistance in compelling the forces of occupation to withdraw from the Sidon area. We have no doubt that, in the event that international legitimacy fails to end the occupation, the Lebanese resistance will be capable of making the occupying forces withdraw from the other Lebanese territory which continues to be occupied by Israeli forces with impunity, in flagrant violation of the resolutions of the Council.

48. We also note with pride that in all areas from which the enemy has been forced to withdraw, all Lebanese factions have demonstrated responsibility; by their solidarity and behaviour following the withdrawal, they have belied Israeli predictions—or rather, wishes—that the withdrawal of the occupying forces would result in blood-baths among the factions of the Lebanese people, as if the occupation was a guarantee for maintaining order, when in reality it has been the source of all the plights inflicted upon the peaceful Lebanese people.

49. The situation prevailing in southern Lebanon, in the western Bekaa and Rashaya district, has threatened international peace and security since the very first day of the Israeli occupation three years ago. Today, the gravity of the situation has increased because of the latest military operations against civilians and the inhuman practices lately perpetrated by the forces of occupation, the details of which have been outlined by my brother, the representative of Lebanon. His letters to the Secretary-General have been full of accounts of such practices. These letters are now before the Council; they all stress the fact that the deterioration of the situation in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and Rashaya district is such that the Council must not let up in its efforts to take decisive action to put an end to this serious situation by eradicating its root cause: the continuing Israeli occupation.

50. We fully support the Lebanese demands that these military operations and inhuman practices must be stopped forthwith, without any delay, and that there must be a commitment not to renew them until Lebanese territory is cleansed of this aggressive occupation. That must take place as soon as possible and without procrastination or delay.

51. We are convinced that the Council will adopt a resolution calling for these things and reaffirming its previous resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982), particularly those provisions concerning respect for the rights of the civilian populations and an end to acts of violence against them. This resolution must compel Israel to commit itself to respect the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other relevant international agreements, especially the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War[1]. The new resolution must include provisions to end Israel's persistence in disregarding Council resolutions time and again. Otherwise, the repeated adoption of resolutions and their repeated flouting will undermine the credibility of the Council and weaken the confidence of the peoples of the world in the United Nations and in its ability to maintain international peace and security or to enforce due respect for the principles of the Charter and the rules of international law.

52. Since 1982, Lebanon has suffered from the effects of the brutal Israeli invasion and the ongoing occupation of a large portion of its territory. It has come today to the Council to call for timely action to save the lives of the civilians who are being killed openly, having committed no crime, having done no wrong. The Council is called upon to protect their homes from destruction and their families from displacement; it is called upon to protect all their rights, so that they will not fall victim to the practices of the forces of occupation.

53. On behalf of the Group of Arab States, I appeal to the Council to live up to the hopes placed in it, by adopting a resolution which will put an end to the reasons that led to the Lebanese complaint before it today.

54. Mr. SHAKER (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me pleasure at the outset to convey my heartfelt congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, this body which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. Today, the friendly country which you represent occupies its deserved place in contemporary international life thanks to its history and its struggle to defend freedom, equality, justice, peace and lofty principles throughout the world. Your country, rightfully, is the leader of the largest international grouping in contemporary history, and we take pride in that fact. The profound historic relations between our two countries makes me all the happier to see you shouldering this important responsibility at a time when the situation in the Middle East is a serious one. I am confident that your diplomatic ability and your well-known skills of wisdom, tact and patience will help you and all the Council to achieve the best possible results.

55. I cannot fail on this occasion also to convey to your predecessor, the representative of France, our gratitude and appreciation for the competence and ability which enabled him to conduct the business of the Council with objectivity. His great qualities of energy, wisdom and patience were of help to us all.

56. Three years after the armed Israeli invasion of Lebanon—three years that have been replete with victims and human tragedies, three years of besieged villages, of repressive practices against the civilian population, the experience of which has been extremely costly—it now seems that the occupation authorities have come to realize that military might, no matter how furious, can be of only limited influence and that the continued occupation of territories not only affects the rights and life of the populations of those territories but also has a profound influence, both in material and psychological terms, upon the occupying forces themselves.

57. The indiscriminate practices of the occupying authority, as made clear by the representative of Lebanon in his

statement in the Council today and on previous occasions, are not only a violation of the principles of international law and the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949[2] and of United Nations resolutions; they also destroy opportunities for peace and coexistence and for breaking the cycle of violence and halting the endless round of killing and destruction. Both the leadership and the people of Egypt wish to reaffirm their strong rejection and condemnation of such practices, and call for an immediate end to be put to them, in accordance with international law and the will of the international community.

58. Israel has invaded Lebanon on two occasions: in 1978 and again in 1982. It has carried out air raids, ground actions and sieges of villages; it has employed local militias. All its attempts have failed, one after the other, to bring about peace or achieve security. This failure has strengthened the conviction of the international community and world public opinion, as well as opinion inside Israel itself, that the indiscriminate use of force is of limited effect and is self-defeating.

59. In the view of the international community, the only option or alternative available to Israel today is the complete and unconditional withdrawal to international borders in accordance with the repeated resolutions of the Council, in order to enable Lebanon to regain true sovereignty over all its territory, to shoulder its national responsibilities, namely, the protection of its population, whether Lebanese or Palestinian, to exercise its authority and to restore security and order.

60. We do not just hope, but demand that Israel's stated intentions to proceed to complete withdrawal from Lebanon and its actual implementation of the first phase of that operation be a prelude to a genuine and imminent withdrawal that will respect the inviolability of international borders, adhere to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon and lead to the achievement of security through peace and coexistence. Indeed, we do not confine ourselves to hope. We are asking—we are demanding—that the preliminary stages of the withdrawal from Lebanon be translated into fact and that they represent a long-awaited implementation of the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, a principle that is as applicable to Lebanon as it is to all other occupied Arab and Palestinian territories. The beginning of the withdrawal from southern Lebanon should, in our view, be the historic beginning of a real withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories in Gaza, the West Bank, Jerusalem and the Golan Heights.

61. The Israeli military presence in the villages of southern Lebanon is in itself a standing threat to the safety, security and stability of the daily lives of the population. The fact that in southern Lebanon the citizens have shouldered their national responsibility for defence and resistance represents a natural reaction to the Israeli occupation and indiscriminate practices. Repressive measures will not be able to stop the tide of national resistance. The only solution to this situation that we can envisage is an accelerated withdrawal within a clear and comprehensive time-frame.

62. The Lebanese experience has demonstrated to all the sterility of the policy of force and the inevitability of an end to occupation and of the restoration of the unity of Arab soil, be it Palestinian, Lebanese or Syrian. It has also confirmed that peace and coexistence are the only alternatives to the killing, destruction and psychological undermining for which Israel is paying dearly on a daily basis.

63. The dynamics of peace, the only option open to the peoples and States of the region, will prevail. The forces for peace in the region and in the world as a whole urge a break in the cycle of rejection and violence and call for Israel to put an immediate end to its inhuman and indiscriminate practices against local populations in Lebanon and to withdraw from every inch of Lebanese territory and all other occupied Arab territories. We repeat what we said in the Council last August, namely, that it is necessary to respond to Lebanon's demands, foremost among which is that Israel be compelled to respect and to implement the provisions of the 1949 fourth Geneva Convention and of Security Council resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

64. To this, we would add a call for the United Nations, represented here in the Council, to shoulder its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security by supporting peace-keeping machinery in Lebanon within the framework of complete Lebanese sovereignty and with the agreement and full co-operation of that country. In this connection, we should like to pay a tribute to the role played by UNIFIL.

65. Lebanon deserves the full support of the United Nations and of the international community for restoring its vitality and effectiveness on the national, regional and international levels. Arab peace is indivisible. Arab rights are indivisible. A comprehensive peace based on justice proceeds from the bases and principles agreed upon by the international community and embodied in the resolutions of the United Nations, foremost among which are the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, guarantee of the right to self-determination to the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and the right of all States and peoples in the region to live in security, peace and dignity in accordance with the principles of international law, justice, and the purposes and principles of the Charter.

66. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

67. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council.

68. I also want to take this opportunity to thank last month's President, Mr. de Kémoularia, the representative of France, for his wise leadership of the Council in January.

69. There are certain basic assumptions about sovereign rights—or rather, there are certain basic assumptions sovereign States accept and expect from one another: they

expect them to keep law and order within their borders; they expect them to keep to agreements they signed, regardless of outside pressure; they expect them to prevent the use of their territory as a terrorist base against other States. But since the early 1970s, Lebanon has not prevented its citizens from slaughtering one another; nor has it resisted Syria's occupation of most of the country and its dictates to Beirut to abrogate Lebanon's solemn international commitments; nor has it prevented the PLO from occupying the south and launching terrorist attacks against Israel from Lebanese territory.

70. It was this last Lebanese failure that led Israel to act in 1982. We did what Lebanon, had it asserted its sovereignty, should have done in the first place: we struck at the PLO's terrorist bases in the south from which terrorist attacks were launched not only against us but also against many countries represented here; we then tried to reach an understanding with Lebanon aimed at providing peaceful relations and stability in the south in order to expedite the withdrawal of our forces. Such an understanding was reached, in fact, in the 17 May 1983 agreement; it was approved overwhelmingly by the parliaments of both Lebanon and Israel. But as the Syrian army lobbed shells into Beirut, the Lebanese Government caved in and broke the agreement. From that day on, all Lebanese actions, including today's exercise, would be carried out only with the approval of Syria.

71. Despite Lebanon's about-face, we agreed to meet the Lebanese at Naqoura to negotiate security arrangements which, among other things, would facilitate our withdrawal. But Lebanon, again under Syrian pressure, refused. It was after this last Lebanese abrogation of responsibility, after all other avenues were exhausted, that we chose to act on our own.

72. On 15 January, my Government decided to withdraw our forces in three phases to the international border. As we enter the second phase of our withdrawal, we still seek the widest co-operation to complete it in as orderly and peaceful a manner as possible. I must therefore confess that, like my Government, I was considerably puzzled at the Lebanese request to convene the Council at this time. During the long months that accompanied Israel's decision to withdraw, the Beirut Government did not respond to the urgings of my Government to co-ordinate our withdrawal. It had not agreed to arrange an orderly transfer of authority, including the use of United Nations forces, as a way of minimizing violence in the evacuated areas. Everyone here knows that these urgings—private and not so private—took place. In fact, many of the countries represented here not only supported Israel's position; they actually joined us in urging the Lebanese to adopt a more responsible position. As has by now become customary, Lebanon could not act without Syria's approval, and such approval was not given—I may add, even when the safety of Lebanon's own citizens was at stake. And during this past year, as daily violence and terror erupted in Beirut and in Tripoli and in Syrian-controlled parts of Lebanon, the Lebanese did not come before this body once to express their concern for the safety of their citizens in these areas. As Tripoli was decimated by rival PLO factions and pulverized by Syrian tanks, we did not hear from Lebanon in this chamber; nor did we hear from it as Syria's artillery shelled the Presidential Palace in Beirut; nor did we hear from it as car-bombs exploded daily and rival factions mauled each other in Beirut and elsewhere in Lebanon. We did not hear a word—and I use words I heard here today in this Council—about Lebanon's endangered "sovereignty and territorial integrity", about the "loss of lives and property", about blameless civilians being killed for no reason, about "the terrible agony of our [Lebanon's] people".

73. It appears then that the fate of most of the country—which is controlled directly or indirectly by Syria—is of no concern to the Lebanese Government, and curiously, it is only when Israel is involved that a sudden concern is voiced by Beirut. It expresses its seeming indignation when the Israeli Defence Force, after unusual restraint in the face of countless provocations, takes the necessary action to protect its soldiers. Indeed, all our actions have been directed at preventing terrorists from attacking us and from organizing a safe haven for future attacks on us as we leave Lebanon.

74. For let us not forget what we all know has been happening in south Lebanon: Israel is not entering Lebanon, it is exiting from Lebanon; and it is precisely after this withdrawal was well under way that an accelerated and fanatic campaign of terror was put into motion. What is the aim of these fanatics who openly take their instructions from Syria and their inspiration from Khomeini? It cannot be to cause Israel to decide to withdraw from Lebanon; Israel already decided to begin its withdrawal from Lebanon many weeks ago. It cannot be to facilitate Israel's departure; such attacks only hamper a speedy withdrawal.

75. I should note here that the claim that Israel is not sincere in its withdrawal plans because it has not published an exact timetable is unfounded. More than once Israel's leaders have expressed their belief that the withdrawal is expected to take from six to nine months. Specifying a more exact timetable is not practical, since conditions on the ground change with each phase of the withdrawal, especially since the terrorist attacks may require a modification in the Israeli forces' timing and procedures.

76. The terrorists, backed by Syria and Khomeini, understand our decision to depart better than anyone else; but they are interested in two things: First, they want to shed as much Israeli blood as possible. They have in fact killed 10 Israeli soldiers and wounded 46 since Israel began its departure, soldiers who were in the process of leaving Lebanon. Secondly, they want to seize control of the evacuated areas and ultimately of all of Lebanon, and their hatred is not limited to Israel; it is also directed at those Lebanese who do not share their violent visions for the country.

77. Now, has the Lebanese Government done anything to confront this terrorism and fanaticism? Rather than acting to curb it, it has echoed Damascus' exhortations for further violence. It has not only decided to curry favour

with terror; it has actually decided to incite it. Nabih Berri, for example, the Lebanese Minister for the South, went so far as to announce on 6 February, after Israel began its withdrawal, that the Government would pay monthly wages to those who attacked Israel's forces. He added that the main function of his Ministry was "to import weapons, dynamite and mines" to the area. Some in the Beirut Government may entertain the misguided hope that this aiding and abetting of terrorism will deflect hostility that is now directed at them to other targets in Lebanon. This explains, perhaps, but does not justify, the encouragement given the terrorists by President Amin Gemayel, Prime Minister Rashid Karami and other members of the Lebanese Cabinet. Their incitements, by the way, came between 17 and 19 February, after Israel completed the first phase of its withdrawal; and they were, let us remember, praising the actions of the very people who had not only toppled their Government but created in its place a violent and fanatic new order in Lebanon.

78. In time perhaps the Lebanese Government will reconsider its reckless courtship of these fanatics. It will be interesting to see if in a year or two it still displays the same enthusiasm for the gunmen in the south. As for Israel, we do not have to justify to anyone—least of all to those who encourage our attackers—our determination to continue to protect our soldiers and our people. It was to protect our civilians in the north from terrorist attacks that we entered Lebanon in the first place. We never intended to stay, and, as everyone can see, we are leaving.

79. But let no one confuse our decision to depart with our commitment to continue to defend our towns and villages. Furthermore, as we leave we do not intend to permit murderous attacks on our forces to take place with impunity. And as we leave, we will take every measure necessary to prevent further killings.

80. Listening to the indignation expressed at Israel's acts of self-defence, one has to pause and consider what is actually going on here. Israel, which is leaving Lebanon, is attacked twice. It is attacked on the ground in Lebanon by terrorists; it is attacked politically at the United Nations by some of the supporters of these terrorists for having the temerity to defend itself. But defending its forces and its people is one of the obligations of a sovereign Government. It is one that the Government of Israel has fulfilled, is fulfilling and will continue to fulfil. And equally, we shall continue to defend ourselves against those who in diplomatic forums would deny us the elementary right of self-defence. This is precisely what today's exercise—seemingly called for by Lebanon but really orchestrated by Syria—is designed to achieve. It is a thinly disguised propaganda effort by them to score points against Israel. It actually hampers the withdrawal that they profess to be in favour of. It should be rejected out of hand.

81. Rather than focusing on Israel's actions to prevent terrorism, the Council would do better to seek ways to curb the terror that still plagues Lebanon—the same terror that cruelly claimed the lives of peace-keeping soldiers sent in good faith by members of this very Council. And rather than joining those who incite violence and hatred, the Government in Beirut should find the courage to assume the responsibility that comes with true sovereignty by helping end terror in the south as well as everywhere else in Lebanon.

82. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

83. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

84. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset it gives me pleasure to express to you, Sir, our deep satisfaction at your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, a month replete with dangerous developments related to the peace and security of our region as well as the peace and security of the world as a whole.

85. At a time when your country is shouldering the leadership of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, your presidency of the Council has a particular significance, because that Movement has always been faithful in achieving the principles and objectives of the most important and largest political group in the world, a group that represents the aspirations of billions of people striving for independence, freedom, the establishment of relations based on equality and justice between peoples and States and the eradication of colonialism and of hot spots of tension, aggression and foreign occupation. Your country's constructive role in international politics, your personal qualities and your wisdom, objectivity, patience and deep understanding of the dimensions of the political problems facing the international community today, all guarantee that you will assist the Council in undertaking its serious responsibilities, in particular the maintenance of international peace and security.

86. On this occasion it gives me satisfaction to express to Mr. Claude de Kémoularia, representative of France, our appreciation and admiration of the ideal way in which he presided last month over the Council's work. We hope that through its permanent membership of the Council, his country, France, will be able to deliver a cultural, political and historic message aimed at the creation of a better world based on the principles of freedom, equality and fraternity.

87. The representative of Lebanon has previously had occasion to resort to the Council, at the end of August 1984 [*S/16713*], when he put before the Council a complaint concerning a series of dangerous violations perpe-

trated by the Israeli occupying forces in southern Lebanon, including the fact that Israel had been working to lay siege to the occupied south in order to suffocate it culturally, politically and economically so as to force the inhabitants to emigrate and to prevent the Lebanese who had left from returning to their homes and jobs in the occupied south.

88. In his previous complaint [*2552nd meeting*], the representative of Lebanon described a series of acts that, according to the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] are serious violations, war crimes whose perpetrators should be punished. He appealed to the Council to bring Israel to put an end to the perpetration of such barbaric acts. However, the Council was unable to adopt a purely humanitarian resolution calling on Israel to put an end to its violations and to commit itself to the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention because of the unjustified United States veto [*2556th meeting*]. This in turn encouraged Israel to perpetrate further violations of the human rights of people subjected to occupation. The American veto caused deep disappointment in those circles that wrongly thought that the United States was able to translate what it calls its human ideals into political action to protect human rights.

89. That is further proof that the United States looks at humanitarian issues through a politically selective window, having regard to imperialist interests in the world.

90. Today the Council is considering a new Lebanese complaint. The Council cannot possibly condone the barbaric acts perpetrated by Israel in southern Lebanon about which it is given information in the annexes to documents S/16974 and S/16974/Add.1. It must clearly condemn them. Those acts are, in particular, serious violations of articles 32, 33, 49, 53 and 55 of the fourth Geneva Convention. The Council must take the necessary deterring measures in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, bearing in mind that States parties to the fourth Geneva Convention have committed themselves, under its first article, to respect the provisions of the Conventions. That in turn makes the task of protecting civilians in southern Lebanon an international responsibility, an obligatory commitment of all the contracting parties, individually and collectively.

91. In the Lebanese letters and annexes there is information about the siege of Lebanese villages by the Israeli occupation forces: the demolition, including dynamiting, of homes; the detention of dozens of people; the indiscriminate firing at civilians; the searches of houses and places of worship, killings and assassinations; the prevention of the return to their villages of students and the detention of teachers. Villages and cities are under siege in order to starve the inhabitants, and pressure is put on families to force them to leave their homes. All those barbaric acts are in clear contravention of article 33 of the fourth Geneva Convention, which strongly prohibits mass punishments. It also prohibits pillage, acts of usurpation and reprisals against those protected under the Convention or against their property. Article 147 of the Convention describes those acts as war crimes if perpetrated against peoples or properties protected by the Convention. These include killings, torture, inhuman treatment and acts that lead to grave pain or affect the body or health, as well as acts of dispersion and displacement.

92. Furthermore, the Israeli occupation forces have adopted stronger measures to prevent the leaking of information on the crimes perpetrated by their military forces in the south of Lebanon. The international mass media have repeated, on a large scale, what *The New York Times* stated in its edition of 27 February, when John Kifner wrote that the Israeli army had banned Western journalists from entering territory occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon. He added that the order had come as the Israelis imposed a dusk-to-dawn curfew on the sixth day of what had been described as an "iron fist" operation—Rabin's policy—against the occupied south.

93. The article said that Israeli aircraft had dropped leaflets south of the Litani River warning Lebanese that they would risk their lives if they ventured outside their homes during the curfew. The authorities had prohibited the use of cars that carried only the driver, and the leaflets warned that cars parked by roadsides without their drivers would be blown up routinely.

94. The correspondent wrote of friction between journalists and the Israeli authorities, saying that in recent weeks leading up to the Israeli pullback from Sidon, there had been a number of incidents in which journalists at the Awali River crossing point had been fired at. He also wrote of the confiscation of films and videotapes. Both NBC News and CBS News had entered a formal protest over an incident in which a rifle had been fired close to the face of an NBC News correspondent, Bonnie Anderson, to discourage her cameraman from filming.

95. Despite those Israeli attempts, the international media have provided information about the barbaric mentality of the Israeli army, which reminds us of the Nazi occupation of Europe. *The Washington Post* of 21 February reported that:

> "The Israelis also shot and killed a farmer, Ali Maaz, who wandered into the village from his fields apparently unaware of the Israeli order to gather in the schoolyard.
>
> "French troops patrolling as part of the U.N. peacekeeping force scuffled with the Israelis. The doctor said they intervened after the Israelis hit a four-month-old child with a rifle butt and fired at a boy."*

In the same edition of *The Washington Post* it was reported that:

> "U.N. spokesmen said the Iraelis rounded up about 200 men for questioning and bulldozed a house. Later a man was found dead just outside the village with three bullets in the head and three men were wounded, one

* Quoted by the speaker in English.

seriously. The spokesmen said the Israelis, unusually, had denied a U.N. request to send a medical evacuation helicopter for the wounded villagers, who were later taken by ambulance to the U.N. hospital in Naqoura on the Mediterranean coast."*

96. Furthermore, *The New York Times* of 22 February this year reported:

> "The large scale of the Israeli operation was indicated by reports from witnesses late Wednesday night that about 20 Israeli Merkava tanks and as many as 80 other military vehicles had passed the headquarters of United Nations peace-keeping troops at Naqoura on their way into southern Lebanon.
>
> "Reports reaching Beirut said an armoured force of 17 vehicles entered Deir Kanun this morning while another force of 27 armoured vehicles went into Teir Dibba.
>
> "Tonight, however, Lebanese State television said 150 armed vehicles had been involved in the attack on Deir Kanun and it quoted residents as saying that 'it was like a whole new invasion'."*

97. The meaning of all this is that the Israeli occupation forces, contrary to their claims, are indeed strengthening their military presence in the occupied territories. Anything to the contrary is untrue. *The Washington Post* on 22 February quoted Mr. Goksel, spokesman of UNIFIL, on the barbarism of the Israeli forces in these terms:

> "In Deir Qanun a Nahr, according to Timur Goksel, spokesman for the U.N. peace-keeping forces in southern Lebanon, Israeli troops rounded up about 90 men for questioning, arrested 10 and demolished a house. U.N. forces later found one man, 25, dead with several bullet wounds in the head, and three wounded in the village."*

98. These are some of the criminal Israeli practices. Had I wishes to continue enumerating these violations I would take up much of the Council's time. What is currently happening in southern Lebanon shows clearly that Israel is using State terrorism as a means of entrenching its occupation. In the lightr of its terroristic actions against the inhabitants, it seems that Israel remains in southern Lebanon in order to realize its economic and political ambitions. Israel's propagandizing on a wide scale about its so-called voluntary withdrawal in stages is only an act of deceptions, and the representative of Israel stresses that fact when he says in the Council that Israel is reviewing its unilaterally set time-frame in the light of developments. What developmens? All that we learn of here is the repression of the inhabitants. Those are the developments The Israeli army becoming stronger is also a development. The barbaric Israeli acts against civilians is merely a perpetuation of Israel's occupation and continued presence in the south. Israel has deceived the innocent and the naive, but it will not be able to deceive those living under its barbaric occupation in the south. It cannot deceive the Lebanese people, and this has been demonstrated by their persistence in their heroic struggle. The evacuation from Sidon and its environs was not the result of a change in Israel's expansionist strategy but merely a calculated Israeli operation based on maximizing benefits and minimizing loss of lives and money. Israel's withdrawal from Sidon and its environs is merely a redeployment of forces in lands that lie within Israel's expansionist plans, and in particular those lands containing hydrological resources.

99. The representative of Israel a few minutes ago spoke at length about Israel's withdrawal. However, not once did he mention withdrawal to internationally recognized borders, and he spoke for half an hour. These was not one word saying that the Israeli withdrawal was to be to the internationally recognized borders.

100. The use of the word "withdrawal" is but an attempt at deception. To the Israelis, "withdrawal" means strengthening their occupation of the south.

101. If Israel was serious about its withdrawal, as it claims, it would not have perpetrated massacres and atrocities against the inhabitants of regions it now occupies. Israel's refusal to provide the Lebanese with a time-frame of the stages of its so-called withdrawal to the international borders—and we stress, to the international borders—is clear proof that it is indeed not a withdrawal to the international borders; it is a continued presence south of the Litani River, with the co-operation of a handful of mercenaries led by Lahd.

102. These ambitions are at the root of the Israeli barbaric acts. They are behind the escalation of the aggression against civilians. The Prime Minister of Lebanon has described the Israeli acts as barbaric and Fascist. We do not believe that we in Syria could have forced the Prime Minister of Lebanon to utter words, as the representative of Israel claimed, to the effect that Syria has been imposing its will on Lebanon.

103. If Israel really intends to withdraw, why does it undertake acts of mass detention, mass killing, repression, the destruction of homes, the terrorizing of women, children and the elderly by every means? Why does it kill children? Why does it destroy homes? Why does it destroy orchards? Why does it lay siege to towns? Why does it prevent the collection of corpses, and why does it prevent the International Committee on the Red Cross from undertaking its tasks in the villages that are laid siege to and stormed by Israel? Israel's aims are made perfectly clear through its practices aimed at creating an atmosphere of fear and instability, so that the person falling victim to Israeli practices is left only the choice of facing death or leaving his land. Israel really wants these people to leave their lands so that it may usurp these occupied territories. Here the Israeli planners have made a mistake, since Israel is today faced with a heroic resistance, because the final decision of those Lebanese suffering under occupation is to stay in Lebanon and to defend themselves, their homes, their lands, their values and their dignity.

* Quoted by the speaker in English.

104. What is currently taking place in southern Lebanon reminds us of the acts perpetrated by the Zionist gangs before the creation of that racist State. It reminds us also of what has happened and continues to happen in the West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights since 1967.

105. After the United States actions in hindering the implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) the latter demanding that Israel withdraw immediately and unconditionally, the Lebanese resistance, shamelessly termed by imperialist circles as terrorism, reflects the legitimate entitlement of the Lebanese people to defend their rights in accordance with internationally recognized principles. That resistance is no different whatsoever from the resistance of the European peoples during the Nazi occupation in the Second World War. It is no different from the struggle of the Namibian people against the occupation by South Africa. It is no different from the resistance of the peoples in southern Africa against the racist régimes that were set up for the enslavement of the weakened majority by the tyrannical minority. The heroic Lebanese national resistance against the fourth most powerful army in the world is an example of sacrifice and a shining light to which heroes look to regain their dignity, to liberate their land and to maintain the territorial integrity and independence of their country. We in Syria are proud of this Arab resistance against our joint Zionist enemy.

106. In his speech before the Eighth National Conference of the Ba'ath Arab Socialist Party on 5 January, the President of the Syrian Arab Republic stated,

> "Israel's ambitions in our countries, in our Arab nation, cannot be stopped by hopes. They cannot be stopped except by a stubborn, long-range struggle. They can be ended only by enduring the sacrifices needed to achieve this. This is exactly what today is being done by the heroic Lebanese Arab people. Our people in Lebanon are an example to all Arabs. It shows us the way to destroy Zionist arrogance, the way to destroy Zionist ambitions for expansion in the Arab nation.
>
> "The Arabs will not regain their rights as long as they do not take the same road as the Lebanese national resistance. The Arabs will not maintain their pride and dignity unless they make the same sacrifice as the Lebanese national resistance.
>
> "We stand fully by the side of the Lebanese and fully support the Lebanese national resistance."

107. The latest developments have shown that the Lebanese people in all its communities is fully aware of the inevitability of coexistence and reconciliation among the various Lebanese communities. This awareness belies what the Zionists have been saying: that the communities of the Lebanese people would jump at each other's throat as soon as Israel evacuates the Sidon area and that massacre is inevitable. However, that theory, which casts doubt on the capability of the Lebanese authorities to expand their authority, has proved to be wrong—and here I quote the representative of Sidon, Mr. Nazih Bizri, as reported in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 19 February:

> "They were . . . stirring trouble. But we were vigilant and alert. All the religious groups realized that Israel was plotting for a clash between the sects of the area, and we succeeded in uniting them, and not only preventing fighting but creating friendships."*

In the same issue of that newspaper the following was reported:

> "One of the first civilians to cross the Awali Bridge after the Israelis had gone on Saturday was a Maronite Christian priest, the Reverend Joseph Azzi, from the Christian Kharroub region just north of the river.
>
> "'I've come to express coexistence between the Lebanese communities', Reverend Azzi said, smiling as he watched Muslims chanting 'Alluhu akbar' (God is great) and swarming over the advancing Lebanese Army. 'Now that the occupation army is gone, we welcome the Lebanese State and its armed forces, since this is the way of bringing together the Lebanese of all sects'."*

108. As we participate in this discussion, we wish to remind the Council—and particularly the United States—of the necessity to take measures immediately to put an end to the suffering of the Lebanese people. We believe that the radical solution is implementation of two Council resolutions—508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Resolution 509 (1982) demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally from the occupied Lebanese territory.

109. The events in Lebanon have shown that it is useless for any party—and more particularly, the United States and Israel—to try to derive benefits of any kind in return for complete Israeli withdrawal to the internationally recognized borders.

110. If the Council decides that the shedding of innocent blood must stop and that Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and integrity must be maintained, it must stand up to the American-Israeli blackmail. We have learnt from the Lebanese national resistance that it is impossible to bring a people to its knees when that people insists on regaining its usurped rights.

111. The events in Lebanon since 1982 have shown a complete collapse of the foreign policy of the United States concerning Lebanon and that region. In the American equation, there is no place for resistance. Here, too, the United States has made a mistake in its evaluation of the Israeli invasion, which it encouraged and supported by all means.

112. The failure of the 17 May 1983 agreement—mentioned by the representative of Israel—is material

* Quoted by the speaker in English.

proof of the fact that the fate of the region, whether Israel likes it or not, cannot be decided by American aeroplanes and tanks; it cannot be decided by the United States Sixth Fleet; it cannot be decided by the capabilities of the Israeli Army. It is fully in the hands of the struggling peoples of the region.

113. We call on the Council to shoulder its responsibilities immediately. We call upon it to take all measures to eliminate acts of aggression against Lebanese territory. We call upon it to restore that territory to its rightful owners. We are convinced that the United States, which continues to dream of subjugating the area to its hegemony through Israel, will achieve nothing.

114. In conclusion, the Syrian Arab Republic stresses that it stands at the side of the Lebanese people and will continue to provide assistance and aid so that that people can liberate its land from the Israeli invaders.

115. I believe there is some objection to what I have said. I hear the representative of the United States laughing. There is nothing wrong in using the term "imperialism". The American establishment—not the American people—the American Administration uses not only the term but also imperialist acts. The presence of the United States in all parts of the world through missiles, nuclear weapons and other forms of military presence is nothing other than the manifestation of imperialism, seeking to plunder the riches of peoples.

116. Why does the representative of the United States laugh every time the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic mentions the fact that the United States of America indeed represents international imperialism? He laughs either because he does not take the Council seriously and does not respect it, or perhaps because he has no argument to refute anything in my statement.

117. I shall make my conclusion again and should like the representative of the United States to listen to it rather carefully. I wish he would not forget that we listen to him respectfully and very carefully; we have never interrupted the representative of the United States in the General Assembly, although we could have done so. If he does not like our statement, perhaps he can come with further information and refute it. I resent the fact that the United States finds imperialism a laughable matter; on the contrary, imperialism is a fact recognized by the United States. I cannot provide quotations from American sources to prove this point right now, but they are proud of that. I really do not see any reason to laugh. The representative of the United States should not do so. If he has any objections, they should be addressed through you, Mr. President.

118. In conclusion, the Syrian Arab Republic stresses that it stands at the side of the Lebanese people. It provides it with assistance and help in order to liberate its land from the Israeli invaders, because what links Syria and Lebanon is—and I believe the representative of the United States is fully aware of this—stronger than the plans of all the enemies of Lebanon, Syria and the Arabs in general. Fraternal Lebanon will always find that fraternal Syria will never deny it support or assistance. We shall not leave our Lebanese brothers alone facing this dangerous situation created by Israel in order to push the region to the brink of explosion.

119. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): We wish to congratulate you, Sir, on being President of the Council this month, and also to express our appreciation for the great skill and wisdom with which your predecessor, the representative of France, led us during the previous month.

120. I wish first to note with profound sorrow the news which my delegation received last night, namely the passing of one of our former colleagues, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. Mr. Lodge served his country as a distinguished public servant and as an involved and interested citizen for four decades. In particular, he served the cause of freedom and international understanding at the United Nations when he was a representative to the Organization, from 1953 to 1960. He has not only left behind him an extraordinary record of devoted service to the cause of our highest ideals, but he has also left many friends, here and throughout the world. While we—the United States and the United Nations—have lost a friend, we retain the memory of a man whose ideals and example will continue to serve as our inspiration and our model.

121. This is not the time to delve into the details of the tragedy in Lebanon. The United States, it goes without saying, deeply sympathizes with the plight of the Lebanese people; they certainly have endured more than their share of suffering.

122. However, we do not believe that this recourse to a Security Council resolution at this time—a resolution which is likely to be one-sided—is the best way of achieving our common objective of confirming the authority of the Government of Lebanon over its entire territory, particularly those areas now under Israeli occupation. In fact, we fear that that approach now is likely only to make worse an already extremely difficult and volatile situation.

123. We believe that the violence in the South and the counter-reaction to that violence only make withdrawal more difficult, and that this works against Lebanon's interests. We have consistently supported an orderly and rapid Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon, and indeed we understand that the Government of Israel is committed to that same objective. We agree that it is essential to do everything possible to expedite withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon.

124. To implement this shared objective, the United States believes that a practical approach to the problems of south Lebanon is necessary. That is why we have supported the United Nations initiative to hold military-to-military talks between Lebanon and Israel at Naqoura. The United States urges both countries to return to Naqoura to continue this constructive process, and in that way to find practical ways to implement the second and third stages of Israel's withdrawal.

125. The United States urges that this debate not stray from the main task before us: the withdrawal of Israeli forces from southern Lebanon in an orderly fashion, and the achievement of a secure frontier between Lebanon and Israel.

126. The PRESIDENT: I believe I am reflecting the sentiments of the members of the Council when I say that we share the grief of the delegation of the United States over the passing away of a former United States representative on the Council. I should like to request the United States delegation to convey our deep condolences and sympathies to the bereaved family.

127. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): I wish first of all to associate myself with my colleagues who have congratulated you, Sir, on the authority with which you have carried out the duties of President of this Council.

128. I should like to say a few words, addressed particularly to the delegation of the United States, about Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, whom I knew very well in my youth in the Organization. He was a member of the Council for eight years—longer, I think, than any other member of the Council. He always displayed a profound confidence in the mission of the Council and of the Organization. He was a friend of my country, deeply acquainted with our culture, and a member of the *Légion d'honneur*, our national order, and was decorated with the *Croix de Guerre* with palms. I wish to say on behalf of my country that we shall forget neither his active participation in the liberation of our territory nor his confidence in the Organization.

129. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

130. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I have a small correction to the statements attributed to me by the representative of Syria. He said that Israel did not really plan to leave Lebanon, and I think he adduced as proof the fact that in my remarks I had not mentioned my Government's decision to withdraw to the "international border", as he said. In my remarks, I said that "on 15 January, my Government decided to withdraw our forces in three phases to the international border" [*para. 72*]. I would recommend that the Syrian representative follow his own advice: to listen carefully and to pay close attention to what is actually said, not what he would apparently like to hear said.

131. Beyond this, I was gratified to see Syria's concern for Lebanon's sovereignty and independence. Are we, therefore, to expect Syria finally to recognize Lebanon as an independent country? Will Syria finally send an ambassador to Beirut? It has not yet done so; perhaps it might choose to do so now.

132. The Syrian representative also said that Syria does not impose its will on Lebanon. This is a fiction, I assume he meant to say. I suppose that shelling the capital of Lebanon does not constitute an imposition of will in his mind. I suppose that the 50,000 troops occupying over 60 per cent of Lebanon do not constitute instruments of imposition of will.

133. But, given these statements that we heard today, can we expect a Syrian announcement soon, a Syrian announcement of a withdrawal of Syrian forces from Lebanon? Can we, in fact, expect to see a demonstration of Lebanon's new-found independence of Syria by having the Lebanese Government call for a convening of the Council for the speedy withdrawal of Syrian forces? I think that from our point of view a general timetable of, say, six to nine months would be perfectly sufficient to demonstrate Syria's genuine intention finally to give Lebanon its freedom and independence.

134. There are a few other items that merit comment in the Syrian representative's statement. It was gratifying to hear of his concern for human rights, for the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[1], for the agony of people suffering barbaric acts; it was gratifying to hear Syria's concern for violations of human rights, the indiscriminate firing upon people, torture, freedom of the press. All those concerns expressed by the Syrian representative would now, one would hope, be acted upon by the Government in Damascus. It could, for example, arrange for restitution to be paid to the residents of Hama, 25,000 of whom were slaughtered or fired upon; it could perhaps use the opportunity to act upon the various condemnations of its torture of prisoners, as documented in repeated reports by Amnesty International. I think that the régime that used tank regiments to pulverize a living city and that uses the foulest of tortures on its political prisoners has no moral ground for lecturing the Council about human rights and breaches of the fourth Geneva Convention.

135. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Lebanon has asked to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call upon him.

136. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Owing to the lateness of the hour, I shall try to be as brief as possible. I have listened to the distortions of fact and falsehoods uttered by the representative of Israel. I was not surprised at such desperate attempts to obfuscate the facts, justify the measures taken and find excuses for the policy of repression and terrorism.

137. If we say that we still have lingering doubts with regard to Israel's intentions to withdraw, it is because Israel wants to take without giving. It wants to take, but it wants to give to itself the right to do whatever it wants, without any deterrent whatsoever. Yesterday, Israeli forces crossed the Litani River and re-entered the region from which they had withdrawn two weeks earlier, laying siege to the village of Zarariyah.

138. No one could more keenly desire Israel's total withdrawal to international borders than do Lebanon and the Lebanese. Lebanon's relations with Syria are fraternal and good-neighbourly relations that date back to long before the birth of the State of Israel, and those relations are

solely a Lebanese affair with which Israel has absolutely nothing to do. To say that Syria was behind the call to convene this meeting of the Council is refuted by the aforementioned Israeli practices, because the south of Lebanon, western Bekaa and Rashaya district are Lebanese regions, not Syrian. The decision to ask for a meeting of the Council is a Lebanese decision, whether the representative of Israel likes it or not.

139. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

140. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I apologize for asking to speak again at this late hour, but I believe that the statement of the Zionist representative forces me to say two things.

141. First, no official Israeli figures and statements, including the Rabin plan for withdrawal, mention withdrawal to internationally recognized borders. Proof of this is the attempt by Israel to obfuscate its presence behind the so-called Southern Lebanese Army. Israel is attempting to create an Israeli entity using the name of an Arab traitor in the south.

142. Syria is not responsible to Israel for either its presence or its non-presence in Lebanon. I am not compelled to answer such a question in the Council. However, every representative here, every member of the Council, has heard the words and statements of the officials of the Syrian Arab Republic to the effect that the Syrian Arab Republic will withdraw from Lebanon when the acts of aggression perpetrated against the Lebanese people by Israel end. We have said this publicly and said it bilaterally, and we have repeated it. We are not afraid to make such a declaration because relations between the Lebanese people and ourselves are a matter of destiny. Such bilateral relations and the manner in which they are conducted are completely outside the purview of the representative of Israel. He cannot impose on Lebanon the creation of any relations. He cannot say that Syria must recognize Lebanon or vice versa. Lebanon is an independent and sovereign State, and what the representative of Israel does not want to understand is that the peoples of Syria and Lebanon are but one people with two independent Governments. That is what he does not want to understand. The Israeli representative wants to distort the facts in order to delude some—and I repeat, some—members of the Council.

143. As for the question of human rights, I would like to quote from a news despatch from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency in order to give some idea of the morals—or rather, the immorality—of the Israeli army. On 25 February—and I hope there will be no errors in interpretation to arouse the laughter of the representative of the United States—we read the following press report entitled "Need to Maintain IDF Morality," a title that might be thought strange but which we Syrians do not find strange because we know Israel, even though States that believe Israel to be a developed and democratic State in the west of Asia—a *lebensraum* world where democracy is expressed by means of occupation, killing, beating, torture, displacement of inhabitants and destruction of—. I should like to demonstrate the kind of morality, or rather, immorality of that army from a well-known Zionist source:

> "In weekend Israel Radio interviews, former Chief of Staff Rafael Eitan and Colonel Meir Pail, a left-wing military historian and former Knesset member, both of whom are at opposite ends of the political spectrum and almost invariably disagree on any issue, were in rare agreement on the need to maintain the morality of the IDF.
>
> "They were commenting on soldiers' statements on radio and television reports that the IDF should take tougher action, even against women and children, to protect themselves 'as this is the only language the Lebanese know'. The soldiers complained that guerrillas and terrorists in Lebanon frequently use women and children as screens to protect themselves from IDF units. They said the South Lebanese Army (SLA) shot at women and children and 'maybe in Lebanon we have to do as the Lebanese do'."*

144. This is the immorality of the Israeli Army. At the highest level in Israel these two persons with the widest possible difference between them in the political spectrum agree on this. As for the morality of Shamir, the leader of the Stern Gang, Shamir himself says—and this is a quote from the Israeli broadcasting authority in Hebrew—in response to the following question:

> "Sir, are you in favour of expelling people from the territories who are involved in terrorism?"*

The answer of Shamir, the well-known terrorist, the killer of Count Bernadotte, was:

> "Expulsion is a most efficient tool and should be used with regard to people whose expulsion will lead to a decrease or elimination of terrorism."*

145. It seems that Israel considers anybody who moves to be a terrorist because it is the occupying Power. The actions and practices mentioned by the representative of Lebanon, perpetrated against civilians and not military personnel, and the collective punishment meted out by the Israelis clearly show that Israel wants to annihilate anybody and anything that moves in southern Lebanon because in no way whatsoever can a man say that "explusion will lead to a decrease or elimination of terrorism."* This means elimination of all the people in the south, because all the people in the south—men, women and children—are against the Israeli occupation. Does that mean that we must wipe Lebanon off the map so that the Israeli Army can be satisfied and at peace? Does that mean it is our job to satisfy what the Israeli Army and the democracy created in the region by the United States wants? I say no. I have many quotations, but I know time is short; however, here

* Quoted by the speaker in English.

is what just one Israeli source said only a few days ago, on 15 February:

> "The entire [Israeli] Cabinet views the Golan Heights as an 'inseparable part of Eretz Yisra'el' and this is supported by the Knesset resolution of December 1981, Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir stated in an address reported by ITIM."*

I will let it go at that.

146. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to make a statement and I call on him.

147. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you for your words of welcome addressed to me on my appointment as representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the Council. There is no need here to say what a great responsibility has been entrusted to every member of the Council, the primary organ of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. For our part, we in the Ukrainian delegation and I myself will actively co-operate in the performance of the important tasks facing the Council under the Charter of the United Nations.

148. I should also like to take this opportunity to greet you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. All of us in the Council have had sufficient occasion to appreciate your great personal and diplomatic accomplishments.

149. We should also like to thank the representative of France for his conduct of the proceedings of the Council in January.

150. Since this is my first statement in the Council, I wish to welcome the new non-permanent members of the Council, the representatives of Australia, Denmark, Madagascar, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago and wish them success in their work in the Council.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.

---

* Quoted by the speaker in English.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] *Ibid.*, Nos. 970 to 973.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—April 1994—2,050